UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/812,422	03/30/2004	Shinji Katayama	042196	1269
	7590 01/09/2007 , HATTORI, DANIELS	EXAMINER		
1250 CONNEC	TICUT AVENUE, NW	WILKINS III, HARRY D		
SUITE 700 WASHINGTON, DC 20036			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1742	
	·			
SHORTENED STATUTORY	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVER	Y MODE
31 D	AYS	01/09/2007	PAP	ER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/812,422	KATAYAMA ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
	-	Harry D. Wilkins, III	1742			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any (CRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLICATION OF THE MAILING DISIONS OF TIME MAILING DEPOS OF TIME MAIL	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timwill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status		•				
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on					
·	•	—· action is non-final.				
′=	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
٠,۵	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Dispositi	on of Claims					
-	·	÷ .				
-	4) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
	Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) is/are rejected.					
	Claim(s) is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
·	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	olaction requirement				
8)⊠	Claim(s) 1-17 are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.				
Applicati	on Papers					
9)□	The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.				
. 10)□	10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage 						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
	oo wa alaanaa aalalaa ahaa aalan igi a list	or the definited deplets flot rederive	u .			
Attachment	:(s)					
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary				
	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P				
	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	atent Application			

Application/Control Number: 10/812,422 Page 2

Art Unit: 1742

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- Claim 1, drawn to a gas diffusion electrode, classified in class 204, subclass 280+.
- II. Claim 2, drawn to a bonding method, classified in class 156, subclass 60+.
- III. Claims 3-7, drawn to a bonding method, classified in class 156, subclass 60+.
- IV. Claims 8-10, drawn to an electrolytic cell, classified in class 204, subclass252.
- V. Claims 11-16, drawn to a sealing method, classified in class 156, subclass 60+.
- VI. Claim 17, drawn to a repairing method, classified in class 156, subclass 60+.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Inventions II and I are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product can be made by a non-heat fusion bonding method.

3. Inventions I and IV are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because the combination (IV) does not require the use of heat fusion bonding. The subcombination (I) has separate utility such as a gas diffusion electrode assembly bonded across its entire surface, rather than only at the periphery.

The examiner has required restriction between combination and subcombination inventions. Where applicant elects a subcombination, and claims thereto are subsequently found allowable, any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable subcombination will be examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. See MPEP § 821.04(a). Applicant is advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a claim that is allowable in the present application, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application.

4. Inventions I and each of III, V and VI are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions have different modes of operation. Inventions

Application/Control Number: 10/812,422 Page 4

Art Unit: 1742

III, V and VI operate with a completely different adhesive than the bonding used by invention I.

- 5. Inventions II and each of III, V and VI are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions have different modes of operation. Inventions III, V and VI operate with a completely different adhesive than the bonding used by invention II.
- 6. Inventions II and IV are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product can be made by a non-heat fusion bonding method.
- 7. Inventions III and IV are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make another and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the product does not have to be made with the corrosion resistant synthetic resin coated on a covering sheet.
- 8. Inventions III and each of V and VI are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have

different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions have different modes of operation. Inventions V and VI operate with a completely different adhesive than the bonding used by invention III.

Page 5

- 9. Inventions IV and each of V and VI are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different designs, modes of operation, and effects (MPEP § 802.01 and § 806.06). In the instant case, the different inventions have different modes of operation. Inventions V and VI operate with a completely different adhesive than the bonding used by invention IV.
- 10. Inventions V and VI are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combination. The subcombinations are distinct if they do not overlap in scope and are not obvious variants, and if it is shown that at least one subcombination is separately usable. In the instant case, subcombination VI has separate utility such as for repairing a gas diffusion electrode not made by the process of Invention V. See MPEP § 806.05(d).

The examiner has required restriction between subcombinations usable together. Where applicant elects a subcombination and claims thereto are subsequently found allowable, any claim(s) depending from or otherwise requiring all the limitations of the allowable subcombination will be examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. See MPEP § 821.04(a). Applicant is advised that if any claim presented in a continuation or divisional application is anticipated by, or includes all the limitations of, a

claim that is allowable in the present application, such claim may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application.

Page 6

- 11. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 12. Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions require a different field of search (see MPEP § 808.02), restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.
- 13. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the

record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

14. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Harry D. Wilkins, III whose telephone number is 571-272-1251. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy V. King can be reached on 571-272-1244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Harry D Wilkins, III Primary Examiner Art Unit 1742

hdw